

Title	Abstract of Vol.15, Aug.1998
Author(s)	
Citation	西洋古典論集 (1998), 15: 111-117
Issue Date	1998-08-10
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/68647
Right	
Type	Departmental Bulletin Paper
Textversion	publisher

SUMMARIES

Digression in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (305-355)

Noriko Yasumura

One of the most controversial problems about the *Hymn to Apollo* concerns the composition and unity of the hymn. Since David Ruhnken (1794), most scholars have divided the hymn into a 'Delian' and a 'Pythian' part. I recognise, however, some kind of unity between the two sections, while admitting the separate authorship. The digression of the Typhon episode (305-355) has also often been regarded as an interpolation. However, I think that there is in the arrangement of the motifs a design which contributes to the effectiveness and persuasiveness of the digression. It is the aim of this essay, therefore, to look at the details of this digression, and to see if there is some detectable logic in its connection with a narrative as a whole.

The episode of the dragon functions as the framework of the digression of Typhon. In the parallel of the dragon and Typhon, only the birth of Typhon and the death of the dragon are narrated. The reasons advantageous to the composer for this complicated arrangement are to stress (1) the unrivalled nature of Apollo's first oracular installation; (2) the aetiological design in the name of the dragon; (3) the gender of the dragon; (4) emphasis on the role of Hera.

Being female, the dragon is able to become nurse to Typhon, and this is crucial if we think of the succession myth. Since Gaia has ceased to challenge Zeus after he has established his power in Olympus (according to the *Theogony*), now in the hymn, Hera may attempt to destroy Zeus' order by initiating a cycle of succession catalysed by his son's rebellion; Typhon is the figure who could have overthrown Zeus, helped by the dragon, just as Zeus overthrew Kronos, aided by his nurse, Gaia. The dragon (the nurse),

by helping Typhon, might have played the decisive role in the usurpation of Zeus, if Apollo had not killed her. The killing of the dragon is, therefore, not merely evidence of Apollo's *aristeia*, but contributes a much graver meaning: Apollo intervenes in the succession myth, alleviating the crisis of Zeus. Hera might have accomplished her desire if Apollo had not come to help Zeus—this seems to be the implication of the hymn.

It is startling to begin the hymn with a scene of potential threat. This may imply that Apollo has just returned from the battle with Typhon, and is demonstrating his authority among the gods. Although Apollo could be another threat to overthrow Zeus, his father, Leto assists Zeus, acting as a king-maker by influencing Apollo. The opening scene depicts the celebration both of Apollo's victory over Typhon and an overall peace between Zeus and Apollo. The opening scene and the digression of the Typhon episode are thus inter-related, and illustrative of the wider struggle for cosmic power.

One of the main purposes in selecting the dragon-Typhon story is to sing about Hera. By means of Hera's entrance into the narrative, the encomiastic aim of this hymn is fully achieved. Apollo degrades Hera by destroying the dragon and the end result is the gain of great esteem not only for himself but also for Leto. The killing of the dragon is, consequently, the most critical moment in the process of establishing his dignity and position in Olympus.

To sum up, the digression of the dragon demonstrates the compositional technique of 'a story within a story' and this technique focalises the importance of the dragon. The abrupt transition back to the main narrative emphasises the doublet of the dragon and Typhon, and also functions as a deliberative device, hinting at the broader perspective, but leaving the exact linking inexplicit. Structurally and thematically the hymn can indeed be described as a unity, the digression of the dragon being linked with the rest of the hymn by the devices of repetition and nesting or embedding that constitute the narrative technique. The digression of the dragon, in short, attains its greatest effect through the development and

colouring of the motifs and their arrangement within the structure of the nested narrative.

A Consideration of the Relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: A reply to Usener

Joe Kawakami

The purpose of this paper is to examine the relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It is based on a review of Usener's work "Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias".

The relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* has been disputed by many scholars, and Iterata, especially, have provoked a great deal of controversy. Since Parry's 'Oral Poetry Theory' appeared, however, scholars have disregarded the relation between the epics. In these conditions, Usener made a new approach in distinguishing between a 'typical scene' and an 'individual scene' and in regarding the latter as a reflection of the originality of the poet.

First of all, we have to review his work. He set up 15 significant themes like Achilles and Telemachos, Questioning about Return, The Death of Achilles, The Monologue of Odysseus, Hermes, and so on, contrasting them, and concluding that the poet of *Odyssey* was well informed of the *Iliad*, and tried to rival creatively the poet of the *Iliad*, and its text existed in the making of *Odyssey*.

Second we must ask whether his method is appropriate. Reviewing his work makes it clear that he is wrong to separate 'individual scene' from 'typical scene'. In some cases, the former is used as a part of the latter. They are constructed in such a complicated and close way that they cannot be separated. His mistake derives from a neglect of 'Oral Poetry Theory'. It can explain not only simple combinations of words, but also more

complicated systems in constructing lines and passages.

It follows from the above that both epics have the same complicated system of construction and, in this respect, should be regarded as akin.

Pollution of Homicide in Ancient Greece

Koji Hirayama

One of the striking differences between Homer and early Attic tragedy is that the former lacks fear of pollution, while it is repeatedly emphasised in the latter. Some scholars have argued that this difference is caused by compositional necessity, that is, the epic poets chose to exclude from the world they depicted what the tragic poets exploited for dramatic effect. As far as pollution of homicide is concerned, however, this view is unacceptable. Rather, the difference in attitude between epic and tragedy should be viewed as reflecting an actual change in social attitudes.

It is because pollution was believed to be infectious that it was feared. There is no trace of such a belief in Homer, but the germ of it does exist. It is the idea that when the order of the whole community is marred by an offence of one member of it, the pollution incurred by the offence contaminates the whole community. On the basis of this idea, it can be said that as the prerequisite for the belief that pollution of homicide is infectious, homicide must be regarded as an evil deed that mars the order of the whole community, and this is far from the case in the society depicted in Homer. Therefore the belief in infectious pollution brought about by bloodshed did not exist in the society whose conditions were reflected in "the World of Odysseus."

In the Greek society of very ancient times, some aspects of which we can see in the Homeric epics, there was the practice of blood vengeance, and the murderer, in order to escape being killed by the victim's family,

had to pay blood money (wergild) to them or flee to another country. But in somewhat later times this practice was restricted by the community and, as the polis developed and the power was concentrated, this restriction was reinforced and the practice of blood vengeance gradually declined. What caused this change was the tendency to regard homicide as a great menace to peace and order in society, and as this tendency grew, the belief that pollution of homicide is infectious was shaped little by little.

This belief functioned as a maintainer of order in early polis society. Murderers were banished because of their pollution. The banishment of a murderer was a "purification," or a ritual for restoring the order of society that had been marred by the act of homicide, rather than a form of punishment. When the social structure of the polis became complex as a result of its further development, the belief in pollution of homicide contaminating the whole society ceased to function properly, and the judicial system emerged to take the place of it. Thereafter murderers were judged and punished in accordance with the law. Nevertheless, the belief did not entirely lose its function; it continued to play the role of religious sanction as, so to speak, a parasite on the law.

A good example of this is given in Athenian homicide law. There were provisions whose aim was to protect the polis from being contaminated by the pollution of a murderer: if a murderer was found in places where he was forbidden to go, or within Attic territory after he had been sentenced to exile, he might be arrested or even killed with impunity by anyone who wished. Such provisions became a mere name when the judicial system was fully established; but their existence was still significant for the family of the deceased, for they enabled them to take revenge upon the murderer with their own hands.

All this reveals that the system of Athenian homicide litigation was not so much a maintainer of social order as a means for the bereaved to avenge the dead without marring the order of society.

The Criticism of Rhetorical Education in *Satyricon*

Masahiro Gonoji

Encolpius (hereafter Enc), the protagonist and narrator of *Satyricon*, and Agamemnon (hereafter Agm), a teacher of rhetoric, argue about the degeneration of rhetorical education in the first scene of the remaining fragments of *Satyricon* (Ch.1-6). In this paper, it is suggested that their argument reflects the author's own view about rhetorical education rather than being ironical.

Enc is a so-called 'unreliable narrator,' who has some defect in his character and sometimes twists the facts in telling us his past experience. Most scholars notice this and regard various parts of his narrative as the target of the author's irony. The speeches in the first scene have also been supposed to be foolish talk composed with an ironical purpose. I venture to oppose this interpretation. First I examined those scholars' grounds and pointed out that they are insufficient. Next I offered my own grounds as follows.

(1) Enc is not a person who always gives moralistic criticisms. His attitude in the first scene is exceptional. Therefore, it is not likely that the author made this scene only to show his foolish character, for what he says there is too sincere.

(2) For the plot that Enc is invited to Trimalchio's dinner party, it is not necessary to introduce the scene of a rhetoric school and teachers. There must be a particular reason for that.

(3) It has been pointed out that Enc and Agm's speech style itself is of 'declamatio.' Their oratorical style can be one basis of the irony-view, for it means that they criticize declamatio in the very style they criticize. In my view, the use of the oratorical style is not a sufficient basis for the irony view. In those days there was no convention of molding characters' speeches in the style of daily conversation. It is probable that the oratorical style was not so unnatural, when a character gives a speech of cultural and

literary criticism.

Besides, there is a difference between Enc's style and Agm's. Enc's style is rather clear, while Agm's sentences are very winding and his metaphors are hard to analyze. It is evident that the author made the two styles different intentionally. If the author made Enc's speech as the target of irony, it is inconsistent that he did not make Enc's style as bombastic as Agm's. It is reasonable to suppose that Enc's style is the one the author approves.

On the other hand, Agm's style is apparently bombastic. In spite of that, it should be supposed that his opinion about the corruption of education is the author's. First, it is not silly enough to be judged as the target of irony. Second, in Ch.10, 1 Ascylos says that he couldn't stand Agm's idle 'sententia,' and he calls Agm 'poeta.' This 'sententia' means epigrammatic phrase in the oration, and probably refers to Agm's poem attached to his speech, as the word 'poeta' indicates. This implies Petronius' intention to exclude the prose part of Agm's speech from his irony.

(4) Most scholars agree that Enc always changes his character according to the situation he is placed in. They claim that in the first scene he is playing a role different from what he really is, and it is only a hypocritical pose. In my view, Enc himself is not conscious of his character changing. It is the author who makes Enc play different personalities according to particular purposes. The sincere attitude of Enc reveals the author's intention to show his own view against rhetorical education through the mouth of Enc.